



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

several forms of plastic art, from the grandest sepulchral monuments to the handiwork of the goldsmith, is amply drawn upon and gives occasion to many happy remarks.—H. WEIZSACKER, in *D. Literaturzeitung*, 1892, No. 6.

ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

PLEYTE-ABEL. *Zur Geschichte der Hieroglyphenschrift*, von W. PLEYTE, Conservator am Niederländischen Reichsmuseum zu Leyden. Nach dem Holländischen von CARL ABEL. 8vo, pp. 48. Leipzig, 1890; W. Friedrich.

The public owes much to Abel for making more generally accessible, in his excellent German translation, a series of important articles on the hieroglyphic script, written by Pleyte for a Dutch educational journal. The book is full of new and ingenious observations, and is written in an attractive style. The several steps by which hieroglyphic script passed from an ideographic to an alphabetic character are clearly and skilfully traced.—G. MASPERO, in *Rev. Critique*, 1891, No. 8.

OTTO PUCHSTEIN. *Pseudohethitische Kunst*, ein Vortrag. 8vo, pp. 22. Berlin, 1890; D. Reimer. 1 Mark.

In this, his inaugural lecture [as docent at Berlin University], Puchstein controverts the currently accepted view, first urged by Sayce, that the so-called "Hittite" monuments are the work of people mentioned in Babylonian and Egyptian monuments as powerful in Northern Syria between the fourteenth and twelfth centuries B. C. He divides the monuments into two groups, the younger of which, showing Assyrian influence, cannot be older than 700 B. C., at about which time Sargon subdued to Assyria the regions wherein they occur. The older group (*e. g.*, the sculptures from Sindjirli) show no Assyrian traces, and must therefore be earlier than 700 B. C., but probably not more than one or at most two centuries earlier. Puchstein's main argument is based on the treatment of the type of the griffin (see Furtwängler, *s. v.*, in Roscher's *Lexikon*), and appears to be conclusive. The sculptures at Uejük, in Kappadokia, belong between 850 and 600 B. C.: those of Boghaskoi are later than the foregoing; the reliefs of Ibriz belong to the seventh century B. C.; and the two figures near Nymphi between Sardeis and Ephesos (according to Herodotos, monuments set up by Sesostris) are not much earlier than 800 B. C., and probably were the work of Lydian Heraclid princes or of the older dynasty of the Mermnadae. None of the "Hittite" monuments, therefore, can be dated earlier than the ninth century B. C. These chronological inferences are of course wholly destructive to Sayce's theory. The "Hittite" monuments cannot have been the work of the Cheta, who flourished five hundred years earlier.

Scholars will probably accept at least these negative conclusions of the writer, who speaks with authority and conviction. His new theory, however, as to the origin of these monuments will hardly at once command assent: he suggests that these sculptures are the work of the northern people (of which the Philistines formed a branch) driven back from the Egyptian frontier by Rameses III in 1107, and his suggestion is sustained both by chronological considerations and by the stylistic features of the monuments. But, before a definitive conclusion can be reached as to this point, it will be necessary to decipher the inscriptions. Though not a little remains to be done, this much at least may now be positively asserted—the “Hittite” monuments are not the work of the “Cheta.”—F. DÜMLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 25.

RABOISSON. *Description géographique des anciens empires d'Assyrie d'après les documents cunéiforms. I. Tiglath Pileser I.* 8vo, pp. 84. Paris, 1890; Écoles d'Orient.

The idea of the author—of giving the geography of the various lands conquered by the several Assyrian kings according to the inscriptions of each reign—is excellent; but this is the only point for which the book can be commended. To carry such an idea into practice requires a knowledge of Assyrian and a first-hand study of the inscriptions. Menant's “translations” can by no means be accepted as a satisfactory substitute. The author shows a vicious tendency to identify names that have a similar sound, and takes much satisfaction in his *données homotopologiques et conditions isophoniques*, fair-sounding words that do not relieve the book of its diletante character.—H. WINCKLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 52.

CLASSICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

MAX BENCKER. *Der Antheil der Periegesen an der Kunstschriftstellerei der Alten.* 8vo, pp. vi, 71. Munich, 1890; F. Straub. 1.80 Mark.

This well-written and sensible book opens with an account of the literary activity of Diodoros, Polemon, Heliodoros, the only persons expressly termed *περιηγηταί* in antiquity. Thus is obtained a basis for the enquiry (in ch. II) as to the significance of the *περιήγησις* in general; in ch. III the place occupied in this class of writings by the *περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος* of Pausanias is defined. The results of the investigation are summarised as follows: “*Periegesis* is a branch of what the ancients called *γραμματική*, wherein objects of antiquarian interest were described and discussed in and according to their geographical connection. Originally it had nothing to do with the literature of art and with art-history, but it came to cross them from the fact that all dealt in part with the same subjects. . . . In attempting to form